

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00627 01 OF 02 161746Z
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 INRE-00 SSO-00
NSCE-00 USIE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-13
L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01
SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NRC-05 /089 W
----- 031221 /42

O P 161552Z DEC 76
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1883
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0627

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES
OF DECEMBER 15, 1976

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE DEC 15 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE VIENNA
TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE CANADIAN REP, UK
REP AND US REP, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS TARASOV AND
SHUSTOV, POLISH REP DABROWA AND GDR REP OESER.

2. WESTERN REPS TABLED UPDATED WESTERN DATA FOR WESTERN DIRECT
PARTICIPANTS. EASTERN REPS ASKED WHY WESTERN DATA WAS LIMITED
TO DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, BUT SAID THEY WERE NOT PREPARED TO
DISCUSS DATA AND COUNTING RULES UNTIL THEY HAD HAD AN OPPORTUNITY
TO ANALYZE THE DATA. IN REMAINDER OF SESSION, WESTERN REPS
CRITICIZED EASTERN PROPOSALS FOR ACROSS-THE BOARD REDUCTIONS
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00627 01 OF 02 161746Z

AS UNREALISTIC AND MADE POINT THAT THE WEST CONTINUED TO EXPECT
A SERIOUS EASTERN RESPONSE TO THE DECEMBER 1975 WESTERN PROPOSALS.
EASTERN PARTICIPANTS PRESENTED FAMILIAR ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF
EASTERN FEB 19 PROPOSALS AND AGAINST WESTERN APPROACH.

3. US REP LED OFF, PRESENTING WESTERN DATA AS AUTHORIZED BY

NAC. HE CALLED ON EAST TO ENTER DIRECTLY ON DISCUSSION OF COUNTING RULES. TARASOV MADE BRIEF RESPONSE. HE SAID THE PRESENTATION OF WESTERN DATA WOULD HELP PARTICIPANTS IN THEIR FUTURE WORK. IT WOULD BE NECESSARY FOR EASTERN PARTICIPANTS TO HAVE TIME TO ANALYZE THIS NEW DATA. BEFORE THIS ANALYSIS WAS COMPLETED, EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WERE UNLIKELY TO BE ABLE TO EXPRESS THEIR VIEWS ON THE DATA. BUT, AT FIRST GLANCE, THE DATA PRESENTED BY THE US REP DIFFERED SUBSTANTIALLY FROM EASTERN ESTIMATES OF THE WESTERN FORCES.

4. TARASOV SAID THAT WHEN THE WEST HAD PREVIOUSLY TABLED ITS FIGURES ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER IT HAD NOT LIMITED THESE FIGURES ONLY TO THE FORCES OF THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. HE ASKED WHY US REP WAS NOW EMPHASIZING THAT WESTERN DATA WAS FOR THE FORCES OF WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. US REP RESPONDED BRIEFLY DRAWING ON CONTINGENCY POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP.

5. GDR REP MADE A DEFENSE OF THE EASTERN FEB 19 PROPOSAL AS A SIGNIFICANT EASTERN MOVE TOWARDS THE WESTERN POSITION ON PHASING AND AS MATCHING THE REDUCTIONS OF US NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS PROPOSED BY THE WEST IN ITS DEC 1975 PROPOSAL, BUT WITHOUT DEFECTS OF THE LATTER.

6. CANADIAN REP CRITICIZED EXCESSIVE AND UNREALISTIC NATURE OF EASTERN INSISTENCE ON ACROSS-THE-BOARD EQUAL PERCENTAGE REDUCTIONS. EASTERN REPS MUST REALIZE THAT THE WEST WOULD NOT CONTRACTUALIZE EASTERN NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY IN MILITARY MANPOWER AND MANY MAJOR ARMAMENTS. HENCE, IT WAS HARD TO UNDERSTAND WHY THE EAST PERSISTED WITH THIS APPROACH IF IT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00627 01 OF 02 161746Z

REALLY DESIRED TO MOVE TOWARDS AGREEMENT.

7. TARASOV CLAIMED THE ROAD TO PROGRESS IN THE VIENNA TALKS WAS BLOCKED BY THE FACT THAT THE WEST WAS ADHERING TO ITS ORIGINAL POSITION. THE MORE SPECIFIC OBSTACLES TO AGREEMENT WERE (A) WESTERN INSISTENCE ON ASYMMETRICAL REDUCTIONS; (B) FAILURE TO ASSURE A SECOND PHASE CONTRIBUTION TO REDUCTIONS BY NON-US WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS; (C) EXCLUSION OF AIR FORCES AND OTHER ARMAMENTS IN THE AREA FROM REDUCTIONS, INCLUDING ALL ARMAMENTS HELD BY NON-US WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA; (D) THE INEQUITY OF ASKING FOR A COLLECTIVE CEILING FOR WESTERN PARTICIPANTS AND NATIONAL CEILING FOR SOVIETS; (E) INEQUITY OF THE METHOD OF REDUCTION PROPOSED BY THE WEST, WHERE THE WEST WOULD REDUCE BY INDIVIDUALS WITHOUT THEIR ARMAMENTS AND THE SOVIETS BY A TANK ARMY WITH ALL ITS ARMAMENTS; AND (F) LIMITED MILITARY SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WESTERN PROPOSALS IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THE US COULD INTRODUCE OTHER NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS INTO THE AREA AND, THAT WITHDRAWN US NUCLEAR DELIVERY VEHICLES

COULD BE REDEPLOYED BACK INTO THE AREA AND ADDED TO FORCES OF NON-US WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS.

8. UK REP SHOWED HOW THE DEC 1975 WESTERN PROPOSAL ADDED IMPORTANT NEW ELEMENTS TO WESTERN REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS, WHEREAS THE EASTERN FEB 19 PROPOSAL MARKED NO CHANGE WHATEVER FROM PREVIOUS EASTERN POSITION WITH REGARD TO REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY BOTH SIDES. HENCE, THE EAST CONTINUED TO OWE THE WEST A SERIOUS RESPONSE TO THE WESTERN PROPOSAL.

9. POLISH REP SAID PARTICIPANTS SHOULD AGREE ON THE BASIC PRINCIPLES: (A) THAT ARMED FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED BY ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS; (B) THAT ALL COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES SHOULD BE REDUCED; (C) THAT REDUCTIONS WOULD BE BY EQUAL PERCENTAGES; (D) THAT EACH SIDE SHOULD USE THE SAME METHOD OF REDUCTIONS; AND (E) SHOULD ALSO AGREE ON A NON-INCREASE OF MILITARY MANPOWER DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00627 01 OF 02 161746Z

10. AT THE END OF THE SESSION, US REP OFFERED TO ANSWER FURTHER QUESTIONS THE EAST MIGHT HAVE ON WESTERN DATA. TARASOV INDICATED HE PREFERRED TO AWAIT RESULTS OF EASTERN ANALYSIS. US REP SAID THAT WHEN THE TALKS RESUMED, THE WEST WOULD EXPECT EASTERN REPLIES TO WESTERN QUESTIONS POSED IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF JUNE 29, 1976 ON COUNTING RULES USED BY THE EAST. END SUMMARY

FOLLOWING IS TEXT OF DISCUSSION OF DATA.

BEGIN TEXT:

11. US REP WELCOMED PARTICIPANTS. DRAWING ON TALKING POINTS APPROVED BY THE AD HOC GROUP, HE SAID THAT IN NOV 1973, THE WEST HAD TABLED ITS DATA ON GROUND FORCE MANPOWER OF NATO AND WARSAW PACT FORCES AND ON SOVIET AND US GROUND FORCE MANPOWER. WESTERN REPS HAD PRESENTED DATA AT THE OUTSET OF THESE NEGOTIATIONS BECAUSE THEY CONSIDERED THAT REDUCTION AGREEMENTS SHOULD BE BASED ON THE ACTUAL FACTS. TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THE SPECIFIC CONSEQUENCES OF POTENTIAL REDUCTION AGREEMENTS WOULD BE, PARTICIPANTS NEEDED TO HAVE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE EXISTING FACTUAL SITUATION AS REGARDS MILITARY MANPOWER. AGREED REDUCTION AND LIMITATION COMMITMENTS SHOULD BE EXPRESSED IN NUMBERS.

12. US REP STATED THAT ON JUNE 10 OF THIS YEAR, THE EAST HAD TABLED DATA. AT THAT TIME, WESTERN REPS HAD WELCOMED THE FACT THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS WERE BEING PLACED ON A FACTUAL LEVEL, BUT HAD STATED THAT THERE WAS A LARGE AND AS YET UNEXPLAINED DISCREPANCY BETWEEN THE FIGURES THE WEST HAD GIVEN FOR WARSAW

PACT FORCES AND THE TOTALS WHICH THE EAST HAD TABLED. WESTERN REPS SAID THAT THEY ASSUMED THAT THE EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WOULD BE WILLING TO ENTER INTO THE NECESSARY DISCUSSIONS TO IDENTIFY THE REASONS FOR THIS DISCREPANCY. WESTERN REPS HAD ALSO SAID THAT, IN PARTICULAR, THEY WOULD WISH TO KNOW WHETHER THE EASTERN FIGURES INCLUDED ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL ON SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 05 MBFR V 00627 01 OF 02 161746Z

THE EASTERN SIDE IN THE

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00627 02 OF 02 161829Z

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 INRE-00 SSO-00

NSCE-00 USIE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-13

L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-04 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 NRC-05 /089 W

----- 031780 /42

O P 161552Z DEC 76

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 1884

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0627

FROM US REP MBFR

AREA, EXCEPT FOR THE AGREED EXCEPTION OF NAVAL PERSONNEL.

13. US REP SAID THAT, HOWEVER, THE EAST HAD REFUSED TO ENTER INTO A DISCUSSION OF ITS DATA UNTIL THE WEST HAD TABLED FIGURES FOR ITS MANPOWER IN THE AREA VALID AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976. THE WEST WAS NOW PRESENTING THIS DATA AND EXPECTED TO MOVE DIRECTLY INTO A DISCUSSION OF COUNTING RULES AND DEFINITIONS. THE WESTERN FIGURES WERE AS FOLLOWS:

(A) THE TOTAL NUMBER OF UNIFORMED ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL OF WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS WAS 731,000 AS OF JANUARY 1, 1976. THIS REPRESENTED AN INCREASE OF APPROXIMATELY 14,000 IN THE TOTAL FIGURE FOR THESE PARTICIPANTS OWING TO MORE PRECISE COMPILATION SINCE THE NEGOTIATIONS HAD BEGUN.

(B) THE COMBINED TOTAL NUMBER OF UNIFORMED ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY GROUND AND AIR FORCE PERSONNEL OF THE WESTERN DIRECT
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00627 02 OF 02 161829Z

PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS WAS 921,000 MEN AS OF JANUARY 1, 1976. ALL ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE GROUND AND AIR FORCES OF THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS HAD BEEN COUNTED. ONLY ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL WERE INCLUDED. NAVAL PERSONNEL, AS WELL AS RESERVISTS, CIVILIANS, AND THE PERSONNEL OF OTHER UNIFORMED ORGANIZATIONS EQUIPPED WITH WEAPONS WERE EXCLUDED FROM THESE FIGURES.

14. US REP STATED THAT, AS REGARDS WARSAW PACT FORCES, EASTERN REPS WOULD RECOLLECT THAT, IN NOVEMBER 1973, THE WEST HAD TABLED A FIGURE OF 925,000 MEN FOR WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCES. IN THE MEANWHILE, WESTERN REPS HAD INFORMED THE EAST THAT, ON THE BASIS OF REVISED COMPUTATIONS, THE WESTERN ESTIMATE OF WARSAW PACT GROUND FORCE MANPOWER IN THE AREA SHOWED AN INCREASE WHICH WAS SOMEWHAT LARGER THAN THE 14,000 MAN INCREASE IN WESTERN MANPOWER JUST REFERRED TO. THE WEST'S CURRENT ESTIMATE OF THE DISPARITY BETWEEN WESTERN AND EASTERN GROUND FORCE MANPOWER WAS THAT, ON THE BASIS OF THE WESTERN ALLOCATION OF MILITARY MANPOWER BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES, IT WAS MORE THAN 150,000 MEN IN FAVOR OF THE EAST.

15. TARASOV QUESTIONED THE MEANING OF US REP'S REFERENCE TO THE WESTERN ALLOCATION OF MILITARY MANPOWER BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES. US REP EXPLAINED THAT THIS WAS THE WEST'S METHOD OF DIVIDING MILITARY MANPOWER IN THE AREA BETWEEN GROUND AND AIR FORCES.

16. US REP CONTINUED THAT WESTERN REPS HAD ALSO TOLD THE EAST THAT, ACCORDING TO WESTERN ESTIMATES, AND ON THE BASIS OF THE WESTERN ALLOCATION, THE TOTAL OF WARSAW PACT AIR FORCE MANPOWER WAS SOMEWHAT LARGER THAN THE TOTAL OF WESTERN AIR MANPOWER.

17. US REP SAID THAT, AS NOTED, ON JUNE 10, THE SOVIET
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00627 02 OF 02 161829Z

REPRESENTATIVE HAD PRESENTED A DIFFERENT SET OF FIGURES ON EASTERN MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE AREA, BASED ON COUNTING RULES WHOSE DETAILS THE EAST HAD NOT YET ELABORATED. THE FACT THAT THERE WAS A LARGE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN THE TOTALS WHICH THE EAST HAD TABLED AND WESTERN ESTIMATES OF WARSAW PACT MILITARY MANPOWER IN THE AREA LED WESTERN REPS TO BELIEVE THAT THE TWO SETS OF FIGURES NOW ON THE TABLE-- THE FIGURES PRESENTED BY THE EAST AND THOSE PRESENTED BY THE WEST-- WERE NOT FORMULATED ACCORDING TO THE SAME COUNTING RULES. WESTERN REPS BELIEVED THAT THERE WAS SOME RATIONAL EXPLANATION FOR THIS DISCREPANCY, AND THAT IT WAS IN THE INTEREST OF BOTH SIDES TO ENTER ON A COOPERATIVE EFFORT TO IDENTIFY ITS SOURCES.

18. US REP STATED THAT HE HAD JUST MADE CLEAR THE COUNTING RULES THE WEST HAD USED IN COMPILING ITS DATA. WESTERN PARTICIPANTS NOW NEEDED TO BE FULLY CLEAR ABOUT WHAT COUNTING RULES THE EAST HAD USED FOR COMPILING EASTERN DATA. WESTERN REPS EXPECTED THE DISCUSSION OF COUNTING RULES AND DEFINITIONS TO TAKE PLACE IN THE SAME OBJECTIVE AND BUSINESS-LIKE ATMOSPHERE WHICH HAD UP TO THE PRESENT CHARACTERIZED THESE NEGOTIATIONS AS A WHOLE. IN THE INFORMAL SESSION OF JUNE 29, WESTERN REPS HAD POSED FIVE QUESTIONS AS TO EASTERN COUNTING RULES. WESTERN REPS WERE PREPARED TO REFRESH THE EAST'S RECOLLECTION AS TO THE TEXT OF THESE QUESTIONS IF NECESSARY. IT WOULD BE USEFUL IF THE DISCUSSION OF COUNTING RULES COULD BEGIN TODAY WITH EASTERN REPLIES TO THESE QUESTIONS, WHICH THE EAST HAD HAD ADEQUATE TIME TO PREPARE. WESTERN REPS WERE READY NOW TO START ANSWERING POSSIBLE EASTERN QUESTIONS ABOUT WESTERN DATA IN THIS SESSION.

19. TARASOV SAID EASTERN REPS HAD TAKEN NOTE OF THE FACT THAT THE US REP HAD LAST ANNOUNCED THE FIGURES FOR THE MANPOWER OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE NATO COUNTRIES IN THE REDUCTION AREA AS OF 1 JANUARY 1976, INCLUDING GROUND FORCES. THERE WAS NO DOUBT THAT PRESENTATION OF THIS DATA WOULD BE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00627 02 OF 02 161829Z

OF SOME HELP FOR PARTICIPANTS IN THEIR FUTURE WORK. IT WOULD BE NECESSARY FOR EASTERN PARTICIPANTS TO HAVE SOME TIME TO ANALYZE THIS DATA. BEFORE SUCH ANALYSIS WAS COMPLETED, EASTERN PARTICIPANTS WERE UNLIKELY TO BE IN A POSITION TO EXPRESS OPINIONS CONCERNING THIS DATA. HOWEVER, EVEN AT FIRST GLANCE, IT WAS WORTHWHILE TO MENTION THE CIRCUMSTANCE THAT THE DATA WHICH HAD JUST BEEN PRESENTED BY THE US REP CONCERNING THE MANPOWER OF THE NATO FORCES IN THE AREA INCLUDING THE GROUND FORCES DIFFERED SUBSTANTIALLY FROM EASTERN ESTIMATES OF THESE FORCES. (COMMENT: THIS FORMULA IS A NEARLY LITERAL

COUNTERPART OF THE REMARK BY US REP IN JUNE 10 SESSION AFTER EAST
TABLED ITS DATA.)

20. TARASOV SAID THAT IN THE COURSE OF US REP'S PRESENTATION
OF THIS DATA, EASTERN REPS HAD PAID PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO
THE FACT THAT, WHEN THE WEST PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED ITS FIGURES ON THE
GROUND FORCE MANPOWER OF WESTERN FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA,
IT HAD NOT LIMITED THOSE SOLELY TO THE COUN-
TRIES WHICH WERE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS.
IF TARASOV HAD UNDERSTOOD US REP CORRECTLY, THE LATTER HAD
NOW TWICE UNDERLINED IN HIS STATEMENT THAT WHAT WAS IN QUESTION HERE
WAS THE FORCES OF THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN THESE
NEGOTIATIONS. IN THIS CONNECTION, TARASOV WISHED TO KNOW WHETHER
THESE REFERENCES TO DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WERE INTENTIONAL OR NOT.

21. US REP SAID TARASOV HAD CORRENTLY NOTED THAT THE FIGURES
WHICH WESTERN REPS HAD JUST GIVEN THE EAST CONSISTED ONLY OF THE
FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IN
THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS. WESTERN NEGOTIATORS WERE NOT
AUTHORIZED TO INCLUDE FORCES OF NON-PARTICIPANTS IN THESE
FIGURES. TARASOV HAD PHRASED HIS QUESTION BY STATING THAT
US REP HAD UNDERLINED THE FACT THAT WHAT WAS IN QUESTION HERE WAS
ONLY THE FORCES OF THE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THE FORMULATION
OF TARASOV'S QUESTION APPEARED TO INDICATE THAT NON-INCLUSION OF
FORCES OF COUNTRIES WHICH WERE NOT PARTICIPANTS IN THE WESTERN DATA
MAY HAVE CAUSED EASTERN REPS TO MISUNDERSTAND THE PRESENT WESTERN
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 05 MBFR V 00627 02 OF 02 161829Z

POSITION. IN ORDER TO CLARIFY THIS APPARENT MISUNDERSTANDING,
HE WISHED TO SAY THAT THE WESTERN POSITION ON THE COMMON
CEILING HAD NOT CHANGED. EARLIER WESTERN STATEMENTS ON THIS
SUBJECT CONTINUED TO APPLY. AS TO THE SIZE OF REDUCTIONS,
THE MAGNITUDE OF REDUCTIONS WOULD BE AS PREVIOUSLY INDICATED
BY THE WEST. THE DATA ON FORCES OF WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS
DID NOT DECREASE THE SIZE OF WESTERN REDUCTIONS ALREADY PRO-
POSED, NOR WOULD IT CHANGE THOSE PROPOSED FOR THE EAST.

22. TARASOV INDICATED HE HAD NOTHING FURTHER TO SAY AND
TURNED TO GDR REP ASKING HIM TO CONTINUE WITH EASTERN PRESEN-
TATION.
REMAINDER OF REPORT SENT VIA AIRGRAM.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, MEETING REPORTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 16 DEC 1976
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: KelleyW0
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976MBFRV00627
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760463-0470
From: MBFR VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19761237/aaaabfws.tel
Line Count: 376
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: KelleyW0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 29 MAR 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <29 MAR 2004 by hartledg>; APPROVED <16 AUG 2004 by KelleyW0>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF DECEMBER 15, 1976
TAGS: PARM, XH, XT, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006